UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,856	11/01/2000	Darryl Black	10.0790	3720

22474 7590 01/19/2006

DOUGHERTY CLEMENTS
1901 ROXBOROUGH ROAD
SUITE 300
CHARLOTTE, NC 28211

EXAMINER	
LIN, WEN TAI	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/703,856	BLACK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wen-Tai Lin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21-36,39 and 40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21-36,39 and 40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19, 21-36 and 39-40 are presented for examination. Claims 1-19, 21-36 and 39-40 have been amended.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 1-5, 9-10 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by North et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 6505245].

4. North was cited in the previous office action.

5. As to claims 1-4 and 40 North teaches the invention as claimed including: a method of managing a telecommunications network, comprising:

- providing a network management system client (NMS) [e.g., Figs. 7-8; i.e., the console-manager user is a NMS client];
- providing a network management server [e.g., Figs. 7-8; i.e., there must be a server to perform authentication];

- storing user profile data corresponding to a user profile in a first data repository [i.e., the first data repository is a central data repository where the authentication information (e.g., user ID and password in the example of Figs. 7-8) is stored];
- storing network device data corresponding to a network device in the telecommunications network in a second data repository, wherein the first and second data repositories are separate databases [i.e., according to Figs. 9-10, the configuration data of each device (such as DELTA) must be stored at a different location because a user has to be authenticated before being granted to the device configuration information];
- detecting a request from a user for network device data corresponding to the network device, wherein the user request is associated with the user profile;
- generating a data access request by the network management server to selectively retrieve network access data from the second data repository utilizing the user profile data from the first data repository [e.g., the DELTA's configuration data of Fig.10 is retrieved by the system server]; and
- retrieving network device data from the second data repository in accordance with the user request.

[for the last three limitations see Figs. 7-10 and col.15, lines 38-67]

6. As to claim 5, North further teaches displaying the retrieved network device data in a user interface [col.15, lines 38-43 and Figs. 9-10].

7. As to claims 9-10, North further teaches that the user profile data includes a group access level [col.5, lines 22-27; col.14, lines 39-44], wherein authorized users of the group must have a corresponding password [col.5, lines 3-4].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 6-8 and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al. (hereafter "North")[U.S. Pat. No. 6505245], as applied to claims 1-4, 5, 9-10 and 20 above.

9. North was cited in the previous office action.

10. As to claims 6 and 8, North does not specifically teach that the user profile data includes an IP address assigned to the network device.

However, North teaches in one scenario that a remote console may manage a plurality of devices via the Internet [Fig.1b; col.1, line 67 – col.2, line 16] and in another scenario that a plurality of remote consoles may manage a plurality of devices by connecting the remote consoles to a central managing terminal via the Internet [Fig.2]. As such, it is obvious that North's system/method applies to a combined scenario wherein the central managing terminal is only a node in the entire Internet and

communicating from each individual managing console to a managed device would require an IP address that is pre-assigned to the device.

Under such circumstances, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the pre-assigned IP address can be included in each of the user profiles because each of North's remote console has to retrieve information associated with the user's pre-assigned role including which devices can be managed by the remote console and it would facilitate the database management by associating the IP addresses that are assigned to each individual console in the user profile.

Note that, in a sense, the central terminal of North's system functions as a domain name server for the remote managing consoles because the IP addresses of the managed devices are determined at the central terminal.

11. As to claim 7, North further teaches that the user profile data further includes a port identification for a port on the network device [col.4, lines 41-45 and 61-65; 30, 41-1 – 41-N, Fig.2].

12. As to claims 12-16, North teaches substantially the invention as presented in the claims above. North further teaches that devices are arranged in logical groups with events of each group associated with a respective console, which may in turn be referenced by the group name when defining action for an event [See Abstract and col.5, lines 22-27]. Thus although North does not specifically teach how the group name is being used in identifying and retrieving device data from the second data repository, it

is noted that such features are rather obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art because the group name is now part of the key indices in North's database and the use of it would facilitate retrieval of authorized user information and device data from the related database.

13. As to claim 17, North does not specifically teach that the data repositories are relational databases and the user profile data is stored in at least one table within the first database and network device data is stored in at least one table within the second database.

However, storing profile data in a relational database, wherein data entries and their associated attributes are organized in forms of tables, is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store North's first and second data repositories in separate relational databases because (i) relational database is known to be efficient and flexible for expansion; and (ii) for security purpose the authentication information (which is stored in the first data repository) should be separated from device data (which is stored in the second data repository) so that a client can be authenticated to access the device data.

14. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al. (hereafter "North") [U.S. Pat. No. 6505245], as applied to claims 1-10, 12-16 and 20 above, further in view of Lim [U.S. Pat. No. 6434619].

15. Both North and Lim were cited in the previous office action.

16. As to claim 11, North the system communicates to managed devices via SNMP protocol [col.3, lines 7-10]. North does not specifically teach that the user profile data includes a simple network management protocol (SNMP) community string.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Lim teaches an Internet-based service management system wherein SNMP command string and user attributes are stored in a repository (e.g., a user profile included in a relational database) for allowing a remote operator to configure network elements in accordance with specific requirements [col.3, lines 1-29; col.17, lines 35-38].

In light of Lim's teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the SNMP community string in North's user profile data because the SNMP community string is specific in accordance with the level of access right assigned to each user and by including the SNMP community string it would facilitate the access of such information from the database.

17. Claims 18-19, 21-36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al. (hereafter "North") [U.S. Pat. No. 6505245], as applied to claims 1-17 and 20 above, further in view of Official Notice.

18. As to claims 18-19, North does not specifically teach generating, after detecting a user's logon request, a user profile logical managed object (LMO) including at least a

portion of the user profile data from the first data repository and use the LMO to request access to the second data repository utilizing the user profile data from the LMO.

However, Official Notice is taken that logical managed object for repeated access to a designated device or web server such as a cookie is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate a LMO similar to a cookie after a user's logon request is detected because by applying the LMO in the authentication and authorization process, it could prevent a user from repeating the logon process whenever a new connection session to the same target device or website is intended.

19. As to claims 21-26, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1, 18 and 20, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1, 18 and 20 above.

20. As to claim 31, North further teaches that the network device data retrieved from the second data repository comprises configured resource data associated with the group name [col.4, line 61- col.5, line2].

21. As to claims 27-30, 32-36 and 39, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-4, 12, 14-16, 18, 26 and 36, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4, 12, 14-16, 18, 26 and 36 above.

22. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/6/05 for claims 1-19, 21-36 and 39-40 have been fully considered but not moot in view of the new ground of rejection (note that the reasoning for the independent claims are different from the previous office actions).

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the contest of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(571)273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 16, 2006

1/16/06